



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,923	04/26/2001	Erin H. Sibley	PD-201008A	2070
20991	7590	02/09/2005	EXAMINER	
THE DIRECTV GROUP INC			USTARIS, JOSEPH G	
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION RE/R11/A109				
P O BOX 956			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245-0956			2616	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/844,923	SIBLEY, ERIN H.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Joseph G Ustaris	2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/26/01.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-12, drawn to distribution of electronic content via satellite means, classified in class 725, subclass 67.
  - II. Claims 13-17, drawn to distribution of electric content that is compressed, classified in class 725, subclass 114.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable.

In the instant case, invention group I has separate utility such as distributing other types of information via satellite.

Furthermore, invention group II has separate utility such as compressing data for distribution over various computer networks. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Georgann Grunebach on 4 February 2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-12. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 13-17 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) was submitted on 26 April 2001. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks et al. (US006160989A) in view of Beckmann et al. (US006675388B1).

Regarding claim 1, Hendricks et al. (Hendricks) discloses a "system of broadcasting digitally channels" over various transmission media, e.g. CATV system, that inherently includes "an allocated frequency spectrum" (See Fig. 1). The system includes a "satellite" (See Fig. 1), "a network operations center uplinking electronic content to said satellite" (See Fig. 1, 202), "an over-the-air digital broadcast center receiving said electronic content from said satellite" (See Fig. 1, 208; column 7 lines 11-34), and a "user appliance receiving said electronic content" (See Fig. 1, 220). Furthermore, after receiving the "electronic content", the system inherently "generates a digital channel signal over at least a first portion of said allocated frequency spectrum" in order to successfully deliver the digital content to the user's site (See column 7 lines

35-53). However, Hendricks, after receiving the "electronic content", does not disclose using a "second portion of said allocated frequency spectrum vertical blanking interval of an analog broadcast signal" to deliver the "digital over-the-air electronic content".

Beckmann et al. (Beckmann) discloses a system for distributing video programs and data using both analog and digital methods. Beckmann further discloses utilizing the VBI of an "analog broadcast signal" to deliver various data (See Figs. 1-3; column 3 line 26 – column 5 line 26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cable headend disclosed by Hendricks to be able to transmit some of the data or "electronic content" within the VBI of an "analog broadcast signal", as taught by Beckmann, in order to efficiently use the bandwidth available between the headend and user terminals thereby increasing the efficiency of the overall system.

Regarding claim 2, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, Hendricks discloses a satellite (stratospheric platform) communicates (coupled) with the cable headend (over the air broadcast center).

Regarding claim 3, Hendricks discloses that one of the transmission media can be a cellular network (See Hendricks column 7 lines 29-34), which inherently includes a "cell tower".

Regarding claim 4, Hendricks in view of Beckmann discloses different types of transmission media (e.g. cellular networks) to the home and suggests that similar technology can be used interchangeably (column 7, lines 29-34). However, Hendricks does not explicitly disclose a TV broadcast tower.

Official Notice is taken that it is well known in the art that TV broadcast towers are used as a transmission scheme. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Hendricks in view of Beckmann to include a TV broadcast tower in order to provide more versatility, options of transmission, and robustness of transmission in case of malfunction by one scheme.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Hendricks discloses both digital audio and video (See column 5 lines 6-16).

Regarding claim 7, the set top terminals or "user appliance" is "fixed" (See Hendricks Fig. 1).

Claim 9 contains the limitations of claim 1 (wherein the system performs the method) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Furthermore, since the system utilizes digital transmission methods, a standard 6 MHz channel within the frequency spectrum will inherently have "excess bandwidth" for extra "digital television broadcast signals" that carry the "electronic content packages".

Claim 10 contains the limitations of claims 2 and 9 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 11 contains the limitations of claims 3 and 9 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 12 contains the limitations of claims 4 and 9 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks et al. (US006160989A) in view of Beckmann et al. (US006675388B1) as applied to claims 1-7 and 9-12 above, and further in view of Owa et al. (US006711379B1).

Hendricks in view of Beckmann does not disclose that the "user appliance is mobile".

Owa et al. (Owa) discloses a digital broadcasting system and terminal. Owa discloses mobile receiving terminals that can receive broadcasts from various sources (See Figs. 1, 23, and 24; column 7 lines 21-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Hendricks in view of Beckmann to include mobile receiving terminals or "mobile user appliance", as taught by Owa, in order to expand the capabilities of the system thereby making the system more convenient for the user by enabling the user to roam freely with the mobile terminal.

### ***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please take note of McCoy et al. (US006526575B1) for their similar methods of distribution of contents.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph G Ustaris whose telephone number is 703-305-0377. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5PM; Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew I Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
JGU  
February 4, 2005

  
ANDREW FAILE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600